

ANSWERING ISKCON

[≡ MENU](#)

Application of the verse 16.14 on Advaitins is untenable.

january 1, 2022 by publisher, posted in arguments against iskcon, bhagavat gita related arguments

Previously I thought Iskcon has upped it's standard, unfortunately that is wrong, it appears that they have lowered their standard, now it appears that the blogger has read my blog previously yet it seems that he has not even understood the point raised by me. He says the following

” . If advaitavāda never said that the world is ‘asat’ or false, then why did entire set of ācāryas countered advaita vedānta over many centuries, starting from Śrīpād Rāmānujācārya, Śrīpād Madhvācārya” .

This means he has not understood the point stated, in either case even if

असत्यम्(Asatyam) stated in the Bhagavat Gita 16.8 is taken to even mean unreal, then

also it cannot be applied to Advaitins, the reason for this is explained in the link below

Why the verse 16.8 cannot be used against Advaita Vedanta Part 3



In answering this we have already removed the objection of why the word Asatyam can take a different meaning other than unreal, we have also shown that Asatyam meant by Adi Shankaracharya in his Bhashya does not mean unreal since it refers to Charvakas, and the verse cannot be applied to Jains or Buddhists or ... Continue reading



Answering ISKCON

1

But however our Iskconite as usual has no answer to this. Now an interesting point is brought up, we have the Bhagavat Gita 16.14 as shown below

मूल श्लोकः

असौ मया हतः शत्रुर्हनिष्ये चापरानपि।

ईश्वरोऽहमहं भोगी सिद्धोऽहं बलवान्सुखी॥16.14॥

English Translation By Swami Sivananda 16.14:

“That enemy has been slain by me; and others also I shall slay. I am the lord. I enjoy. I am perfect, powerful and happy.”

Now here we have ईश्वरोऽहम् (ishwaroham)

Meaning, I am Ishwara. The blogger apparently quotes the Upadesasahasri, to show that Adi Shankara accepted this, hence this Advaitic teaching is demonic or asuric and so on as per him. But before looking at Upadesasahasri, let us check Sri Ramanuja's commentary on the same verse and see what he has to say. Sri Ramanuja comments as follows,

“ईश्वरः अहं स्वाधीनः अहम् अन्येषां च अहम् एव नियन्ता”

English Translation of Ramanuja's Sanskrit Commentary By Swami Adidevananda:

I am 'the lord,' viz., I am independent, and I am also the ruler of others.

So here Shri Ramanuja interprets I am Ishwara as I am independent and I rule over others, no where does Sri Ramanujacharya interpret this “Aham Ishwara” as I am God. Ok

let us look at the commentary of Vedanta Deshika on the same verse who comes in the tradition of Sri Ramanujacharya. Following is what he says

“सर्वेश्वरवदीशितव्यत्वाभावोऽप्यत्रेश्वरशब्देन विवक्षित इत्याह – स्वाधीनोऽहमिति”

Translation: Like the Lord of all (God), although he does not possess control over everything, the word Lord (Ishwara) is used here, we respond by stating that Ishwara here indicates that he is independent.

So even Vedanta Deshika clearly shows that अहं ईश्वरः(Aham Ishwara) is only used to indicate that I am relatively independent, not as I am God. Now Iskconites recognise the Ramanuja Sampradaya as authoritative, so this interpretation of the Sampradaya is directly opposed to their own interpretation, so which interpretation is true, if they state that only their interpretation is true then they have to accept that the interpretation taken by the Sri Ramanuja school is not true. Suppose Iskconites state that both the interpretation of the Sri Ramanuja Sampradaya and their Sampradaya is true, that the verse can be used to bash both Advaitins and Charvakas, then they should be called hypocrites, why ? since the same type of interpretation is taken by Advaitins. But Iskcon will tell, “you Advaitins are deliberately misinterpreting this verse with evil intentions”, so Sri Ramanujacharya also tried to do the same ? Of course we get absolutely pathetic and rubbish responses like “see Advaitins are hiding behind Sri Ramanujacharya to save themselves”. Where is the question of hiding behind Sri Ramanujacharya, I am simply asking if you accept this interpretation of Sri Ramanuja then why can you not accept the same interpretation made by Advaitins. To which the response is verbal abuse, reason being they have absolutely no response to it. Instead they engage a childish person to refute this blog, and that person does not even know how to write a sentence without making a spelling mistakes. This is how pathetic the response of Iskcon is to begin with. Ok let us take for granted that the अहं ईश्वरः(Aham Ishwara) means I am God only. Even then it cannot be applied to Advaita Vedanta, but 1st let us look at the Upadesa Sahasri quote 2.3.1 and 2.10.8 . I tried to find this in Upadesa Sahasri, guess what, I could find no such quote. If any one has any doubt please go through the link below for Upadesa Sahasri

<https://www.sankara.iitk.ac.in/comprehensive-texts>

Once the web page opens, then do a cntrl+F and type ईश्वर, the word is itself not present in Upadesasahasri.

So if this Iskconite is able to find it, he must let me know. Oh well, then let us come to what Adi Shankaracharya actually thinks, he says the following

“ननु एवमद्वितीयश्रुतिरुपरुध्येत न अविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाधिकतया परिहृतत्वात्। तस्य च अपरब्रह्मोपासनस्य तत्संनिधौ श्रूयमाणम् स यदि पितृलोककामो भवति इत्यादि जगदैश्वर्यलक्षणं “

Brahma Sutra 4.3.14

Translation: Certainly the Shruti parts which talk about the Non dual Brahman are opposed, not so, since the objects(of the world) projected by Avidya of name, form and body have been dismissed here. Also with regards to Lordship and things like “if he wills to go to Pitru-loka he goes there immediately” is told with reference to the worshippers of Aparabrahman (Saguna Brahman).

So Adi Shankara is emphatically clear that Aham Brahmasmi does not mean lordship over something. Since the Shruti vakyas or sentences which talk about the Non dual reality denies all name and form in the world, and if there are any sentences in the Upanishad which talk about lordship and powers that refers to worshippers of Saguna Brahman, so where is the question of lordship over something. So this whole idea of Iskcon that, people want to be Ishwara themselves is nonsense. If an Iskconite says that this is what Advaitins say, never believe him.

Finally if the Iskconites still feel that they are absolutely correct, ofcourse they are that pig-headed, then they have to accept that Prahlada is not a great Bhagavata, why since this is what Prahlada has said in the Vishnu Purana

Vishnu Purana Book 1 Chapter 19 verse 86

अहमेव अक्षयो नित्यः परमात्मात्मसंश्रयः

ब्रह्मसंज्ञो अहमेवाग्रे तथान्ते च परः पुमान् ।

Translation: I am only that imperishable, eternal, the very basis of Paramatma and Atma .

I am only in the beginning with the name Brahma , I am at the end and beyond it as well.

But Shri Krishna says the following

प्रह्लादश्चास्मि दैत्यानां Gita 10.30

English Translation By Swami Sivananda

10.30: And, I am Prahlada among the demons.

So, Prahlada has been given such a high status, so this Prahlada got asuric knowledge ? if you look at the verses before Prahlada says this in the Vishnu Purana, you will see that he was contemplating on Vishnu, so contemplation on Vishnu gives Asuric knowledge? contemplation of Vishnu leads to Tamas ? This is what Iskcon is proposing. Ok let us take this also for granted, what about Suka Maharshi, the son of Vyasa who told the entire Bhagavatam to Parikshit, he also gave Asuric knowledge ?

This is what Suka says to Parikshit at the end of Bhagavatam

Canto 12 Chapter 5 verses 11 and 12

अहं ब्रह्म परं धाम ब्रह्माहं परमं पदम् ।

एवं समीक्ष्य चात्मानम् आत्मन्याधाय निष्कले ॥ ११ ॥

दशन्तं तक्षकं पादे लेलिहानं विषाननैः ।

न द्रक्ष्यसि शरीरं च विश्वं च पृथगात्मनः ॥ १२ ॥

Translation: I am the supreme abode, I am the absolute truth, in this way see yourself by putting yourself in your undivided self. When Takshaka with is venom filled fluttering tongue comes and bites you on your leg, do not see your body or the world as different from yourself.

So now Suka gave demonic knowledge, hence Srimad Bhagavatam is demonic ?

Prabhupada in his Bhagavatam translates Atmani as follows” ātmani – in the Supreme Self; ” and Aatmanam as follows

ātmānam – yourself . How the hell did Atmani become “Supreme Self”, he translates निष्कले as follows “niṣkale – which is free from material designation” . In what universe does Kala mean designation? It can mean part or aspect not designation and from where did Prabhupada get the idea of material designation ?

This shows very clearly that the whole idea of Iskcon and Iskconites is hypocrisy and misdirection which is clearly seen in the atrocious translation of Srila Prabhupada.

PREVIOUS POST

HAPPY GREGORIAN NEW YEAR TO ALL my READERS

NEXT POST

Good News!! Iskcon finally refutes itself !!

4 THOUGHTS ON “APPLICATION OF THE VERSE 16.14 ON ADVAITINS IS UNTENABLE.”



therambhakt

january 3, 2022 at 12:14 pm

Very Good.

★ Liked by [1 person](#)

[Reply](#)



Nishant Pandey

october 3, 2022 at 10:35 pm

Brother kindly unveil Myths regarding Madhusudan Saraswati these Isckonites and Kripalu Mahraj Followers say Madhusudan Saraswati accept Dvaita as the final truth in his life

Please write a blog based on that and bust the myths of these Abrahamic people

★ Like

[Reply](#)



Publisher

october 3, 2022 at 10:41 pm

Yes brother looks like this is a necessity now.

★ Like

[Reply](#)



Nishant Pandey

october 3, 2022 at 11:27 pm

Please Do it,
Gratitude

★ Like

LEAVE A COMMENT

[Blog at WordPress.com.](#)